



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Notes and Opinions.

Professor Blass and Chuza.—In the *Expositor* for February Mr. F. C. Burkitt destroys another of the textual guesses of Professor Blass. In Luke 8 : 3 all respectable MSS. read Chuza, the steward of Herod, as the husband of one of the women who followed Jesus. *l*, a Latin MS. of the seventh century, reads Cydias. Chuza is an Aramaic name occurring nowhere else. The scribe of *l*, therefore, according to Professor Blass, came by “Cydias” by a tradition going back to Luke himself! Mr. Burkitt wonders whether by such textual criticism one ought not to say, also with *l* in Luke 2 : 4, 15, that Jesus was born in *Bethel*, and finally disposes of the main assumption of Professor Blass that Chuza is a name not otherwise known, by quoting from Cook’s *Glossary of the Aramaic Inscriptions* an inscription of a tomb of the first century A. D. or B. C. at El-Hegr in Arabia : “*To Hayyan, son of Kuza, his posterity (have erected this tomb).*” In other words, Chuza (or, as the Syriac versions spell it, Kuza) was a Nabatæan—something very likely, as Mr. Burkitt might have said, in view of the fact that Herod’s wife, who had just fled from Herodias to her father, was herself the daughter of the king of Nabatæa. Every bit of evidence such as this helps put an end to the free and easy textual criticism of the great philologist.

St. John’s Creed.—1 John 5 : 18–21 :

“We know that whosoever is begotten of God doth not sin ;
But he that was begotten of God keepeth him, and the
Evil One doth not touch him.

We know that we are of God ;
And the whole world lieth in the Evil One.

But we know that the Son of God is come ;
And he hath given us an understanding, that we may know
the True One,
And we are in the True One—in his Son Jesus Christ.
This is the true God, and eternal life ;
Little children, guard yourselves from the idols.”

This concluding paragraph of the epistle is regarded by Professor Findlay, in the February *Expositor*, as containing the creed of the apostle.

“We know that whosoever is begotten of God doth not sin.

We know that we are of God.

We know that the Son of God is come.”

Or, in other words, says Professor Findlay, “I believe in holiness,” “I believe in regeneration,” “I believe in the mission of the Son of God” —the order of experience, not of theory.

Two things are to be noted: (1) The arrangement and the conclusion are very suggestive. But why separate thus the objects of “We know”? Both the fourth gospel and the first epistle of John make it evident that the apostle believed that the world lay in sin, quite as much as he believed anything else. (2) Professor Findlay’s translation of the second half of 5:18 makes the reference to Christ as the “one begotten of God” rather than to the believer. Such a reading depends much upon the manuscript authority of the reading “him” rather than “himself.” This is sufficient (A B vg) to warrant its adoption by Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort. Is there in it a reference to the miraculous birth of Jesus?

Kruger, Wrede, and Bousset on Methodology.—The leader in the *Theologische Rundschau* for January, 1899, from the pen of the editor, Professor W. Bousset, of Göttingen, is of special interest because indicative of a new departure in the treatment of the New Testament books. The article, pp. 1–15, is entitled “Zur Methodologie der Wissenschaft vom Neuen Testament,” and is based on Krüger’s work entitled *Das Dogma vom Neuen Testament*, and Wrede’s *Die Aufgabe und Methode der sogenannten neutestamentlichen Theologie*. The purpose of the article is to demonstrate that a correct historical method would demand a removal of the barriers which have been traditionally set up between the canonical books found in the New Testament and the non-canonical of the same era, all of these writings being considered as the sources of one and the same religious development. In other words, scientific accuracy and correctness would insist upon ceasing to regard the New Testament books as a unique and peculiar group, from which the other Christian literature should be separated by a deep chasm. Bousset says that such a separation was excusable in the days when the old inspiration theory prevailed, but that this is no longer adhered to. Nor does he regard the intrinsic value of all of the New Testament books as

superior to the non-canonical; *e. g.*, Hebrews, the pastoral epistles, James, and Jude are certainly not richer in contents than 1 Clement, Barnabas, the Didache, etc. In fact, none of the theoretical or practical reasons for the isolation of the New Testament books as sources of a historical development within the apostolic age can justify the current separation. The two writers whom Bousset reviews agree in substance with these views.

There is a good deal to be said in favor of these views of Wrede and Bousset. The problem reduces itself to this, however: Is the study of biblical theology of the New Testament a study of the thought of the church or of the thought of Jesus and the apostles? If it be the former, then it is perfectly fair to say that all the literature of the church should be consulted. If it be the latter, its material must be found within the apostolic writings. So far as we can see, the issue is a fair one, and Wrede's method is certainly legitimate. But is, then, the other illegitimate? The results to be gained from the two possible fields of literature are, to be sure, different. A study of the entire Christian thought of the first century is simply historical. The study of the apostolic writings, on the other hand, always extends the hope that something like authority is to be discovered. Accordingly the rejection of the traditional theory of inspiration by no means obviates the need of especially considering the work of Jesus and the apostles. However valuable the study of the entire literature of Greece during a century, it does not preclude a special study of the thought of Socrates. Is it not, also, altogether probable that the immediate followers of Jesus were most likely to catch and embody his spirit, and in the study of their writings have we not, therefore, a legitimate field of investigation?

"The Lamb of God that Taketh Away the Sin of the World."—The instructive comment of Professor Gilbert in our January issue (pp. 45-6) presents clearly the difficulty which careful students have long felt in accepting this as a saying of John the Baptist, in view of the very different representation of his Messianic ideas given in the synoptic gospels. Without entering into any criticism of Professor Gilbert's argument, it may perhaps be questioned whether the words of John are not open to another reasonable interpretation which, though not wholly removing the apparent inconsistency between the synoptist and Johanne reports of his message, considerably diminishes it. Let it be noticed, in the first place, that the first gospel tells us what sort of a person

John expected the Coming One to be before he had actually appeared — his theory of the Messiah based on prophecy. The fourth gospel, on the other hand, tells what John said concerning Jesus when he saw him after his baptism and, we may add, his temptation. That this latter statement was, like the former, an expression of his conception of what the Messiah ought to be, an inference from his conception of the Messiah and his conviction that Jesus was the Messiah, the Johannine account does not at all imply. It is certainly as probable that these words are his honest, perhaps his astonished, testimony to what he saw in Jesus as he returned to the Jordan. This being the case, this testimony furnishes no ground for impugning the historical accuracy of the fourth gospel at this point, unless it attributes to John a characterization of Jesus not only different from his previously formed conception of the Coming One, but so different that he could no longer have believed (as vs. 34 testifies that he still did believe) Jesus to be that Coming One. Do the words, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," involve such a difference? To facilitate the comparison, let us analyze the characterization into its elements. (1) The phrase "Lamb of God" emphasizes the meekness and gentleness of Jesus. This is apparently not what John expected to find in the Coming One. His expectation had evidently been strongly influenced by such prophecies as those of Malachi, chaps. 3, 4, and he had looked for one who should come in swift and irremediable judgment on impenitent Israel (Matt. 3 : 11, 12). But facts not provided for in one's theory do not necessarily compel an abandonment of the theory. John may still believe that Jesus is the Coming Judge, though he perceives to his surprise that he is meek and gentle, instead of stern and severe. (2) The expression "that taketh away the sin of the world" involves the conception, probably based on Isaiah, chap. 53, of one who takes upon himself the load of other men's sins. Does the fact that John perceives in Jesus as he comes from the awful struggle of the wilderness temptation such a sin-bearer, one to whom sin, the sin of the world, is an awful grief and burden, compel him to abandon his belief that he is Israel's coming judge? There is nothing in his prediction of the Coming One, as given in Matthew, to suggest this element of character, but the recognition of it in Jesus is neither in itself improbable nor necessarily in contradiction with John's maintenance of his belief that Jesus was the Coming One. (3) But the expression "he that taketh away (*ὁ αἰρων*) the sin of the world" seems to involve more than a bearing in sympathetic grief. To this it adds the thought that the sin-bearer

also *takes away* the sin in the sense that, by reason of this bearing of the sin by another, the real sinner is freed from the consequences of his sin. Not only has the Lord "laid on him the iniquity of us all," but "by his stripes we are healed." Can John have thus characterized Jesus and still have held him to be the judge who was to visit the sinner with swift and irremediable judgment? Apparently not. It seems impossible to assign both these characters to one person, unless one separates the two acts, sin-bearing and judgment, in time, or makes the judgment a self-executing judgment, which men pronounce upon themselves when they reject the suffering Savior. But John apparently did neither of these things. It *seems*, therefore, impossible to suppose that the Baptist used a word intended to express the idea of taking away. The Hebrew נָשָׂא, or its Aramaic equivalent, he may have used, since this might express only the idea of bearing, enduring. The Greek φέρω, which the Septuagint uses in Isa. 53:4, he could have used if he had spoken Greek; and had the fourth gospel used this word, we should have no ground for questioning its perfect accuracy at this point. Even the word αἰρων is not in itself incapable of the sense "take upon oneself," "carry." But, since the choice of it in preference to φέρων, its usage in the Septuagint with words denoting sin, its general usage in the Johannine writings, especially its use in 1 John 3:5, all tend to show that the evangelist intended this word in the sense "takes away," it seems necessary to conclude that the sense which the writer intended to give to John's testimony is in part different from that which John himself intended, since it involves a conception of the mission of Jesus which from John's point of view is inconsistent with that which he still expected him to perform.

What is necessary, therefore, to eliminate from the Johannine record any discrepancy with the synoptic account is, apparently, simply to substitute φέρων for αἰρων, "bears" for "takes away," as the word expressing the Baptist's testimony, or to put upon αἰρων a sense which it is in itself capable of bearing, but which, we have reason to believe, was not the sense intended by the evangelist. Whether, in view of the fact that in vs. 36 the testimony of John reads simply, "Behold the Lamb of God," without the addition of the words "that taketh away the sin of the world," it is easier, on the whole, to suppose that the whole of the latter clause is an interpretative addition of the evangelist, or of a subsequent editor, than to assume the lesser change involved in the modification of the sense of a single word of the Baptist in the process of translation or transmission, is a fairly open question. The expres-

sion, "he was manifested to take away sins," in 1 John 3:5, suggests a possible source from which an editor putting together the apostle's records of John's testimony might have derived the clause which appears in 1:29, adding it with the honest intent of bringing out what he supposed to be the real meaning of the testimony. But it is equally possible that the absence of the words in vs. 36 is due to the fact that to the mind of the Baptist and the apostle the expression, "Lamb of God," in vs. 36, needed no defining addition, since the phrase itself now carried with it the color given it in vs. 29. It seems necessary, therefore, to remain content with the assertion that, so far as any argument derived from the synoptic narrative goes, we are only required, when taking *αἰών* in vs. 29 as representing the Baptist's thought, to understand it as the representative of a Hebrew *עוֹלָם* in the sense "enduring," but, when taking it as representing the evangelist's idea, to interpret it in the sense "taking away."

E. D. B.